



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

## MAN AS A MEMBER OF SOCIETY.

### PART III. OF THE SERIES SCIENCE AND FAITH.

OUR INTRODUCTION to the present chapter has been long.<sup>1</sup> It could hardly have been otherwise, seeing that we presented there the broad initial thesis that man is of the same nature as the other animals and subject to the same laws, and that the points wherein he differs from the nearest mammals are only matters of form and of degree.

One of the propositions which resulted from our inquiry was this: impressions engender acts, dependent or not dependent upon the will; these acts by repetition become habits, which are handed down from generation to generation, and becoming established form what are called instincts. We have followed the evolution of three of these, viz.: (1) the instinct of self-preservation,—that self, which in the invertebrates is represented by scattered egos or by egos that are predominant at certain points, and which in the vertebrates has its seat in a special organ and is centralised in a single ego of which the physiological characteristic is egoism; (2) the instinct of reproduction, differentiated in the birds and mammals into the sexual instinct and the family instinct, which latter in its turn is differenced into a maternal instinct highly consolidated and free from all impurity, into a paternal instinct feebly consolidated and complex, and into a filial instinct maintaining a mean in the matter of consolidation and purity; (3) the social instinct which

---

<sup>1</sup> See *The Monist*, Vol. VI., No. 4, Vol. VII., No. 2. Translated from Dr. Topinard's manuscript by T. J. McCormack.

has for its foundation the need of relations with one's fellow beings, or altruism—an extremely variable and complex instinct, scarcely more consolidated than the paternal instinct, yet one which has given rise to a multitude of animal societies from the primitive and negative stage known as indifferent assemblages, up to a form which already reaches a high plane in the Cynocephali and the Cercopithecii. We have seen the variations of these societies. Some are intermittent, others are permanent; some are of the family type, pivoting about a polygamous male, others are formed of families more or less amalgamated.

We have now to continue our inquiry with man. The field is quite different. With wild animals,—the only ones we were obliged to consider,—our information was as a rule insufficient. We were fortunate if we were able to reconstruct the approximate social type of the genus or the species. It was impossible for us to consider the variations according to groups, environments, and *a fortiori*, with few exceptions, according to periods. The question of the evolution of social forms throughout the course of centuries was inaccessible. With the exception, perhaps, of the bees and the ants, science can establish the sociology proper of no animal.

With man it is different. Although all the knowledge we might wish is not always forthcoming, yet generally speaking it is considerable. Man speaks and can personally give us information concerning his manners, customs, and sentiments. He has his history, his archæology, and his legends. He is spread over the whole surface of the globe and divided into an infinite number of groups, frequently having no communication with one another. In his case the problem is no longer that of describing a social type, but of describing a multitude in time and space, where it is our task to determine both the differences and resemblances. Human societies give rise thus to a human sociology proper if not to a comparative human psychology, the scope of which is broad and which involves an endless number of problems. Let us recall the position which this science occupies in the general body of human knowledge.

The second branch of anthropology is divided into two parts :

first, descriptive anthropology, or ethnography, in which the facts are gathered and classified according to two methods, by tribes or nations, and by particular subjects; secondly, speculative anthropology, or ethnology, in which are established the concatenation of the facts so reached, their causes and consequences, and the laws or general truths which flow from them.<sup>1</sup>

Similarly, human sociology is divided into sociography and sociology properly so-called. It occupies itself particularly with the facts gathered by ethnography, as these bear upon the family, society, and morals. It studies in man the associations between individuals free to move and to act, just as in invertebrates we study the associations between the merids or zoids that adhere together. A third part is the complement of the foregoing—social science, that is to say, the applications of sociology to the present phases of human societies, which it is incumbent upon us to correct and to perfect, or, as some say, to remodel, so as to secure the greatest happiness of all or of nearly all consistent with the greatest possible equity. The present article will deal with the first and second parts.

What was man at his origin? How were his first societies constituted, and how have they been evolved, in attaining the present phase? Such are the questions on which we shall have to dwell.

Thus considered, the history of human societies is arbitrarily divided as follows: (1) primitive societies in the true sense of the word; (2) prehistoric societies; (3) the lowest savage societies as yet discovered; (4) the more or less barbarous societies; (5) the more or less civilised societies of Central America on the one hand, of China, India, and Egypt down to Greece and Rome on the other; and (6) societies subsequent to the Christian era down to the present.

Darwin, Spencer, and some others, have sought to reconstruct the primitive man. To start with, he has been progressively formed at one or at several points of the globe at the expense of one or of

---

<sup>1</sup> Dr. Daniel Brinton has excellently remarked: "It is the aim of ethnography (*ἔθνος*, people, and *γράφειν*, to describe) to depict, and that of ethnology to explain."

several precursors. According to the first hypothesis, he was subsequently differentiated into branches which, to judge from the morphological facts in our possession, may be reduced to five or to nine at least, viz.: (1) the blacks with woolly hair, divided into the dolichocephalic and the brachycephalic; (2) the blacks with straight<sup>1</sup> hair, designated by Huxley as Australoids; (3) the yellow races divided into the dolichocephalic and brachycephalic; (4) the browns or Melanochroids of Huxley, small and dolichocephalic; (5) the blonds or Xanthochroids of the same author, large and dolichocephalic. Both hypotheses are tenable, but that of the unity of the types is the most probable. All the primitive varieties of the human species may be said to have been produced by differentiation, adaptation, and crossing in the same manner as the present varieties of the domestic dog according to the palæontologists are sprung from the *Canis familiaris fossilis*. The initial progenitor is said to have been black, dolichocephalic, and prognathous.

The characters which essentially distinguish man from the anthropoids are four in number (*The Monist*, 1895, Vol. VI., pp. 33-44), two of which are physical—perfect adaptation to the vertical posture, and a greater development of the brain in volume, convolutions, and inward structure—and two of which are physiological: speech and reason.

We say reason so as to conform to usage. In reality, at the beginning it does not deserve that name. The animal species, from whose bosom primitive man has sprung, presented, like any high or low group of present men, a scale of very extensive variations. There were found here incapable individuals, absolutely refractory to new acquisitions, indifferent individuals forming the large majority, and finally, individuals evincing some endowment and talent. The latter were the most active, remembering best their sensations and their prior acts, and seeking the hardest to understand things. Some fact attracted their attention, they stopped to consider it, compared other prior facts with it, drew from their comparison

---

<sup>1</sup> The word "straight" is ill chosen but is consecrated by usage. The word "yellow" has the same fault.

some relation, some view of the whole, and acted with a more exact notion of the consequences of their acts. One of the highest faculties of certain monkeys, if not of the majority, is the eager persistency with which they scrutinise an object that has been put into their hands, and keep turning it over until they have gotten clear concerning its ways of working and its use. (Romanes, *Animal Intelligence*.) They then throw it aside and give it no more thought. Primitive man goes farther here. Where a monkey opens a nut with a pointed object, or breaks it with a stone, repeating his act with little improvement, primitive man essays to manufacture some similar pointed object or to make of the stone a hammer. Attention to things which directly concern the satisfaction of his needs, the desire to appropriate these things to this end, and the initiative which he takes, are the characteristics of his first cerebral acquisitions. The ape, his precursor, or the dull primitive man, abandons himself to his hereditary habits, that is to say, to routine. Talented primitive man modifies his conduct and profits by his experience. The making of tools or of improved means of defence against wild animals was without doubt the first step taken by man in the domain of intellect. I believe the discovery of the means of obtaining fire was not made until sometime later. Among the lowest savages we know of, we find legends relating to this discovery, but none concerning the origin of the simplest weapons.

Subsequent progress must have been slow. To judge from the lowest savages of to-day, primitive man showed little foresight. His horizon in countries where congeners were scarce was almost limited to the animals with which he struggled. His needs were mediocre. The excitations which later exercised so great an influence upon the development of his faculties were almost entirely lacking. Yet selection, despite these circumstances, was still at work. The individuals who were best equipped with the power of initiative survived and multiplied. The day came when those who knew how to put to its best use the new instrument which they possessed, the embryonic intelligence which had formed in them, came into the majority and were formally distinguished from the species which had given them birth.

The question has been raised as to which was prior, primitive language or primitive reason. Every impression or sensation tends to give rise, in the absence of attention being directed to it by the ego, to a simple or complex reflex action, in the last case anteriorly co-ordinated by habit. To this class belong the gestures and contractions of the facial muscles accompanying actions, voluntary or involuntary. Thought, by itself, awakes such reflexes. We half shut our eyes, the face expresses joy or pain, the body bends, the hands are unconsciously extended in different directions, as if to deliver the thought. From this point the step is not far to expressing emotions and desires voluntarily by gestures, and even to varying them in particular cases. Gesture language necessarily preceded every other. The physiological analysis which Ribot has given corroborates this position. The imperfectly developed gesture-language of the Australians and the very highly developed gesture-language of the Indians of North America are survivals of it. It had long to supply the needs of primitive man and to contribute to fixing and multiplying his first elementary ideas and particularly his first emotions, but sooner or later it led perforce to the word. Lacking the word, animals possess the general faculty of expressing their needs, sensations, and sentiments in various ways. These ways vary in form and number with the species. Many have three, five, or ten ways, according to what they wish to express. The majority, if not all, are simply co-ordinated reflex acts, some of which are unconscious and others of which are voluntary or alternately unconscious and voluntary. It is quite natural, therefore, that primitive man, as his gesture-language became more precise, should have made an effort to accompany it with sounds in some way connected with what he desired to express. Unconsciously at first, and then consciously, he modulated his utterances by his larynx, and then progressively articulated them with his mouth. He thus soon attained the power of calling in moments of danger, of commanding in the management of his household, or in the chase, and even of recounting during the evenings his adventures after the manner of the howling monkeys, but better.

The power of the spoken word having been once acquired, the

development of mind advanced more rapidly, hand in hand with the development of language. Although words do not engender ideas, they have upon them a powerful influence. They fix them, render possible their classification, and aid thus in the acquisition of new ideas.

In fine, primitive man did not for a long time greatly differ from the animal, be it ape or anthropoid, which was his precursor and from which he sprung. From the animal stage he drew away but slowly. What was he then, from the point of view of family and of society, during the interval between the period when he was definitively formed and the period represented by the modern savage? For the psychical characters we might consult the infant, on the principle which is true in its generality, that ontogeny is a reproduction of phylogeny; but this is not our subject. In conjecturing what were their customs, we should be guided less by present men, who are all more or less modified and perhaps falsified in their habits by circumstances, than by the animals to which primitive man bears the most resemblance.

First, how did primitive man comport himself with regard to reproduction? Did he restrict himself, as is possible, simply to combating his rivals when seeking the female of his choice, to satisfying the needs of rut, and then departing after the manner of many other mammals? Or did he prolong the union until the birth of the young, until weaning, or until after the rearing only, as it is said certain oranges do? Or, did he prolong the union until he had several offspring, that is to say, indefinitely, as some gorillas certainly do? Was he monogamous as is the Soko of Livingstone or polygamous as certain chimpanzees are said to be? As to sociability, did he live alone with his family as is sometimes the habit of the anthropoids, or in small associations of distinct families as is the case with the Soko, or in large societies, as undoubtedly the anthropoids do when they are numerous, and as do also the Cynocephali and the Cercopithecii? This we cannot say exactly.

As for ourselves, in consideration of the varied habits of the anthropoid, and in consideration of the nature of man generally, such as we know him, we think that his social and family types



were not everywhere the same and depended on habits unconsciously contracted, but that generally speaking he was rather monogamous and distributed into social groups. Do we not see him even to-day accommodate himself to all systems? Several considerations corroborate this view. On the one hand, man is even more influenced than the other mammals by the development of those elements that make for sociability and for companionship with his fellows. He has need of loving associates, he is fond of domineering and of displaying his talents, he has need of talking, of singing, of playing, of being listened to and admired. All this is as strongly developed among the lowest savages as among civilised men. Negroes love to laugh, to play the buffoon, to lift their voices : it is the small coin of altruism as of sociability.

On the other hand, man is possessed of more or less motives which impel him to egoism. He reviews his acts, their advantages, and their disadvantages. His reason causes him constantly to vacillate between two tendencies : the one of associating with his fellows for the advantage which he expects to derive therefrom, and the other of entirely dispensing with them, of eliminating their competition.

His conduct, therefore, will differ according to the circumstances. In one place, where climate, abundance of nutrition, and the absence of dangerous enemies render life easy, primitive man ought, after the manner of herbivorous animals, to be gentle and disposed to living in society. In another place where existence is difficult, the means of subsistence scarce, ferocious animals numerous, himself naked and in addition poorly armed, always upon the *qui vive* against surprises or against the possibility of letting slip good opportunities—here he is or was in the position of the general run of the Carnivora and must have lived a life of seclusion, having as his retreat and that of his family some hidden cave, like the lair of the wild animals which were his prototype.

In fine, we may conclude that primitive man was neither better nor worse than the other animals, and in particular than the apes ; that he was neither more sociable nor less sociable and that he had

different habits according to the circumstances: the most widely spread tendency being monogamy and life in little bands.

\* \* \*

It is unnecessary to mention that no primitive type has come down to us. The six or seven so-called primordial races which we assume are only probabilities, induced from those which we have observed to-day, mixed, crossed, married and remarried, ten, twenty, or one hundred times perhaps. The races which must have approached nearest to the type in question are the prehistoric races,—but which? For lack of others, let us look at those of Europe—the only ones that are at all known.

If we accept the conclusion generally admitted in the United States regarding the end of the Glacial Epoch in the region of the Great Lakes and the approximate parallelism of glacial phenomena in America and Europe, the most ancient authentic remains of human industry in the latter country would not go back to more than 10,000 years about. That is not much. It would then be necessary to divide this space of time in Central Europe approximately as follows: the Palæolithic Epoch, 3,500 years; the Neolithic Epoch, 2,500 years; the Bronze Age, 1,800 years; the Iron Age, 300 years; the Christian Epoch, 1,900; total, 10,000.<sup>1</sup> We must draw the conclusion that the most ancient race of men we know of in Europe, that of the glacial alluvium of Chelles, cannot be primitive, and therefore that it took its origin elsewhere. At that moment in fact a formidable barrier of ice descended from Scandinavia not far from the Hartz Mountains and the Black Forest, and joining with the glaciers of Switzerland and Upper Italy left only narrow passages, which greatly restricted communications with Eastern Europe; whilst on the other hand on the South communication with Africa was quite easy by way of several strips of land which have since disappeared. It has been assumed that the men of Chelles, that is to say, of the first Palæolithic Epoch, were of the Neander-

---

<sup>1</sup> I suppose it is well understood that for us the origin of man is older than ten thousand years, but that it must be searched for in other parts of the world than those alluded to in the North of the United States and in Europe.

thal race. The assumption has not been proved. The number of pieces upon which it has been based is ridiculous. I am more inclined to believe that the Palæolithic Race of Chelles was that which we find later on, small, brown, dolichocephalic, extremely orthognathous, and with microseme orbits, spread through all Southern Europe, the isles of the Mediterranean and Northern Africa, and which I have called the Troglodyte race of the Lozère, or better, the Mediterranean race. Evidently it came northward, step by step, from Africa subsequent to the Glacial Epoch, that is to say, from the country where recently in the South of Tunis enormous quantities of Chellian<sup>1</sup> quaternary instruments have been discovered, and where five or six thousand years before our era the scattered tribes circulated that gave rise to the Egyptians, a race of a type still far removed from what the primitive type must have been.<sup>2</sup>

But nothing enables us to say what were the customs of the Chellian race. Its well-fashioned weapons lead us to believe that it manufactured other utensils which have not come down to us.

In the Post-glacial Epoch, with the Reindeer or Laugerie period, the elements of valuation increase. The men of that day lived partly in families in separate caves, partly in small and large aggregations in neighboring caves, or under long shelters beneath overhanging rocks. Although hunters and fishers and without agriculture, they were sedentary, fashioned implements of bone and flint, which they decorated somewhat artistically with the figures of animals, plants, and even of men. They had ornaments and funeral rites, as M. Cartailhac assures us, and procured the articles they needed from considerable distances; at times they undoubtedly exchanged them for others, and they certainly had chiefs. At Solutré, where they lived in villages, they appear to have had reserves of horses for food. In shaping their images and in chipping their pointed flints, they evidently conversed and indulged in the ameni-

---

<sup>1</sup> René Collignon. *Les âges de la pierre en Tunisie*, in *Matériaux pour l'Hist. Prim. de l'homme*. 3me Sér., T. IV., 1887, Paris.

<sup>2</sup> We willingly admit that the type of Java, Neanderthal, and Spy is one of the primitive types of man—scattered over the whole habitable surface of the globe at a certain epoch but accidental in Western Europe.

ties of friendship. Nothing proves that the wound of the woman of Cro-Magnon was the result of a conjugal quarrel. In a word, they had a social organisation which they must have brought from Western Europe and which precludes our regarding them as savages of a low type. At this juncture the barrier of ice had disappeared, and new men of high stature, dolichocephalic, and probably blond, had crossed the passage. For us, the type to which the name of the race of Cro-Magnon has been given is a crossed race, the result of a mixture of the local Mediterranean race of which we have spoken above, with the tall blonds who came as conquerors.<sup>1</sup>

In the Neolithic Epoch which followed, the number of blonds increased; another race, the brachycephalic, was added, which came by the same route. Thereafter the population is divided into groups differing both in physical characteristics and in civilisation. In one place we have the Troglodytes of the Lozère, the most ancient race, a poor and conquered people, who had been forced to take refuge in the least accessible localities. In another, we have the blonds more or less crossed, the makers of the long megalithic monuments. The brachycephalics are scarcely ever seen to predominate at any one point, which may be accounted for by the fact that they practised cremation. One of the most pronounced of the later groups is that of the Palaffites of Switzerland, among whom we see the Polished Stone Age pass into the Bronze Age, and where agriculture and industry are considerably advanced. We shall not stop here; the knowledge we might gather can be more readily gained in connexion with the populations that come later. We may confine ourselves to stating that with the exception of the refugee groups of the small-statured race, which led a really savage life as a whole, the Neolithic Epoch bears witness to a civilisation which is considerably advanced as compared with the epoch called barbarous. Vestiges of superstitions (amulets of human bones) and even of worship (the caves of Baye, etc.), if not of religion (the cromlechs and *alignements* of Brittany) are also found.

---

<sup>1</sup> P. Topinard, *La Caverne de Beaumes chaudes, d'après les registres de Broca*.—*Revue d'Anthropologie*, Paris, 1886.

Let us now pass to the lowest savages known to us, such as they are represented by the historians of antiquity, the travellers of the sixth to the thirteenth century to the time of Marco-Polo, the navigators and foreign conquerors from Christopher Columbus to the end of the eighteenth century, and particularly by the travellers of the present nineteenth century. These descriptions gradually conduct us to the highest savages and from these to civilised man.

In the second half of the eighteenth century the ethnographical movement began to make itself felt. The first work in this direction was, we believe, that of Henry Home or Lord Kames, a philosopher of the Scotch school, who published in 1773 two volumes entitled *Sketches on the History of Man*.<sup>1</sup> The first society was that "for the observation of man," at Paris in 1799. The first "instructions to travellers" were those which were published by that Society in 1800.<sup>2</sup> But little progress was visible until the foundation of two other societies now well known, the Ethnological Society of Paris in 1839, by W. Edwards, and the Ethnological Society of London in 1840, by Prichard. The decisive moment, however, came in 1888 when Messrs. Tylor and Galton applied to the analysis of the manners and customs of peoples the statistical method employed in physical anthropology. To-day ethnology is one of the most popular sciences. England and the United States hold the first place in it by the number and the value of the contributions which they have furnished.

The published works are of four kinds: original matter consisting of descriptions of travellers and their classified replies to the "instructions"; monographs upon some single people or tribe; monographs upon innumerable special subjects, such as marriage, property, polity, beliefs, and folklore; and finally works which aim at synthetical views of the field in its entirety. But as is frequently the case with young sciences, inquirers have not been overcautious premature theories have been promulgated and systems produced

---

<sup>1</sup> P. Topinard, *Éléments d'anthropologie générale*. Paris, 1885. Vigot frères.

<sup>2</sup> *Revue d'Anthropologie*. Année 1883, p. 132.

which were based upon insufficiently established facts, and which have had to be withdrawn. Still, the light is gradually spreading, and I believe I am not too presumptuous in attempting to sum up now in a general way the results of my reading and researches on the subject of this paper.

The great difficulty concerns the palpable beginnings of the evolution of societies. Here inquirers have been carried away by preconceived ideas or insufficient facts. The ethnographical material relative to the higher savages and barbarians is very extensive, but is absolutely meagre with regard to savages very low in the scale.

When we consult the narratives of travellers we find contradictions. One person who has first seen a given group, sees it in one light; another, coming later, sees it in a different light. A third sojourns a long time with the group in question, examines it more minutely, and, being less hampered by European preconceptions, his description destroys a part of what his predecessors have said. The traveller who travels fast always claims to have seen extraordinary things. He describes savages in the lowest imaginable stage which he knows of only by hearsay.<sup>1</sup> We might almost formulate this proposition: there are no very low savages, except such as we have not had the means of carefully studying. The truth is that there are no existing savages justifying the denomina-

---

<sup>1</sup> The following is an example. A certain author indicates as the lowest type of savages which one can imagine, the Guaharibos of the sources of the Orinoco, and gives an astonishing description of them, referring in a note to the Geographical Congress at Havre in 1887. Naturally I ran to the original, but found nothing. I finally discovered elsewhere that at this Congress a lecture had been held by M. Chaffanjon, who had visited the sources. In short, I found a book in which this traveller had given an account of his expedition. It turned out that he had never met one of these indigenous savages; that he had once stumbled upon a camp of seven huts that they had just abandoned; that he had seen a bridge built by them, and that he had derived all his information regarding the indigenous people in question from another tribe who had accompanied him, but who also knew of the other people only from hearsay. In short, putting all together, I found no ground which justified in the least the detailed description which had originally so startled me. I supposed that it had been taken from reporters who had listened to the lecture. See I. Chaffanjon, *L'Orénoque et le Caura*, Paris, Hachette, 1889, and Letourneau, *L'Evolution politique*, Paris, Lecrosnier, 1890.

tion of *primitive* so frequently and wrongly used. We have assumed that the oldest Europeans go back ten thousand years, but in other countries man goes back much further. The antiquity of man is certainly to be doubled or tripled, if not more. Think only of all that must have happened in Africa prior to the tribal precursors of the Egyptians; or in India, among the blacks of the jungle, before the Dravidians, whom the Aryans came upon, had made their appearance. The physical type of the Neanderthal, and even of the Java man, is almost as far removed from the probable primitive type in cranial capacity as some normal Europeans of our days are from that primitive type.

The lowest known savages, those that we can make use of, are only the remains of peoples which have had their history and which at a given moment have been driven back into places not sought by others or possessing natural defences. They are degenerate and retrogressive groups from lack of stimulus. Taking the cases singly, the proof can be established. For the Esquimaux the evidence is complete. A tribe, a people, or a whole race, may become immobilised at a certain stage for a long time. China is an extremely remarkable example of this in four or five points of view. Most of the negroes in Africa are another. A tribe, a people, may even fall behind and be at the point of extinction, when suddenly it will assume new life and energy. Ethnography and history offer numerous examples of this, but in the very lowest stages prolonged retardation is difficult; a certain minimum is necessary for subsisting in given conditions. The group dies away as is the case with all the very low, and even with the ordinary savages we know of. They are powerless to recover their lost vantage-ground, and no case of their having done so is yet known. Happily for us, the degenerate groups stand us in excellent stead for reconstructing the probable course of evolution of the first men, for retrogression is by privilege of inestimable value, being a retracing of the steps through which progression has passed.

We shall cite the groups concerning which we have the best information, and which can best guide us in our inquiry.

First we have the Veddahs, who inhabit the cliffs of Ceylon,

and whom we should not confound with those of the coasts and villages, who have been more or less changed by contact with the Singhalese. According to a Greek author of the fifth century, they occupied the forests they now inhabit, for 1500 or 2000 years. According to the census of 1881 there were only 200 of them still alive.

Secondly, there are the Bushmen of the desert of Kalahari who are one of the southerly scattered fragments of a race formerly spread over a good part of Central Africa of which the Obongos of Du Chaillu, the Akkas of Schweinfurth, the Wambutu of Stanley, are other fragments. The Obongos are a stage higher in type than the Bushmen and the Akkas several stages higher still. The poisoned arrows of the Wambutu and several details which we have from Sporck who has recently visited them lead us to believe that they are not so low as Stanley thought.

Thirdly, we have the Fuegian Yahgans of Tierra del Fuego, who must be distinguished from the Fuegian Onas and Alcaloufs, who are more nearly related to the Patagonians. They were evidently driven back at some unknown period into the benighted region which they now occupy.

Fourthly, we have the Andamans who have inhabited the islands of the Bay of Bengal from the year 851 of our era at least, and whom anthropology regards as the most typical representatives of the Negrito race of which other fragments are found here and there in the Malay Archipelago.

It is difficult to establish the exact rank of these four groups. In certain traits they are lower, in others they are higher. The Veddahs seem to come nearest the primitive state.

Next come the Tasmanians, a race which has recently become extinct and which we can only appraise by information which dates anteriorly to the time when the English began to exterminate them.

Then we have the Australians, which have long been placed at the lowest stage but which are now ranked several degrees higher. But here and there in the ancient reports we have accounts of iso-



lated groups which poor conditions of existence had rendered inferior.<sup>1</sup>

There are also the Esquimaux who formerly extended far South to the boundaries of the United States on the one hand and into Asia on the other, whom warlike tribes drove back into arctic regions and who to-day are disappearing.

We shall merely refer to the few extremely savage and not well known groups of the interior of the isles of Northern Melanesia, of the Sunda Archipelago, of the Philippine Islands, and of the Peninsula of Malacca. In the Deccan, the Ghats, and the Nilgiris, we have found nothing that can serve us. I must say the same for Siberia. In America the lowest savages after the Fuegians are probably the Botocudos of Brazil and certain tribes of Yumas of Lower California. In Africa nothing is to be added to the Bushmen.

It goes without saying that with the space at our command we can make no citations, nor refer to our authorities. We shall give nothing but a simple picture, dwelling only upon the points which we desire to place in relief.

The lowest savages differ in character, disposition, and manners according to the more or less difficult conditions of existence in which they are found, and according as they have more or less connexion with other men, savages or Europeans, who stimulate or falsify their character. In himself, the savage is usually gentle, kind, of an easy disposition, and with a tendency to jollity. He is honest, does not lie, and attempts to do no harm either to his own people or to strangers. He is sensible to kindnesses which have been extended to him, well wishing, and endowed with a goodly portion of altruism. Distrustful, like animals who see for the first time a creature which they do not know, his second impulse is that of gentleness. Nevertheless, he is quick and violent in responding to impressions and may abandon himself to regrettable acts, but he quickly regains his natural tendency and grants pardon when the offence has not been too grave. Before marriage the girls

---

<sup>1</sup> P. Topinard. *Instructions sur les indigènes de l'Australie*, Paris, 1872.

and boys come early under the sway of the sexual instinct, and yield to it neither more nor less than in our civilised countries. The savage woman is chaste and modest, although nude. Her parents carefully watch her; she will have one lover or several, or she will be debauched; if in the first case she has a child, public opinion requires that the youth should marry her and take charge of the offspring. After marriage the couple are faithful in the same degree that they are in our modern societies, if not more so. The husband always keeps the same woman. The instance which Darwin cites without mentioning the source is typical. "The cliff Veddahs are monogamous until death," said Bailey to a polygamous Singhalese. "Yes," responded the latter, with a contemptuous smile, "like the Wanderoo." The ape to which allusion was here made, is a *semnopithecus* of Ceylon. Bailey was a missionary who had lived twenty years with the Veddahs and has described them in the *Transactions of the Ethnological Society of London* for 1862.

The husband repudiates his wife only exceptionally. In case of adultery he punishes her or strikes her, and no one interferes. Marriage takes place without any formality. The young man asks for the consent of the father, and sometimes makes him some small present; the girl is not consulted. Sometimes marriage is not definitive until after conception or the birth of a child. The very low savages are generally monogamous (Veddahs, Bushmen, Andamans, Esquimaux, and the Negritos of the Philippine Islands). But if he feels himself capable of supporting several wives, either from vanity or from finding his interest therein, he becomes polygamous, his first wife in that case retaining the supervision of the household. The monogamous father loves his wife; she is his companion in this social phase, and not his slave. She shares his labors. He hunts, manufactures arms, canoes, and does the heavy work; she has charge of the household and the children, gathers wood, fetches water, and carries the burdens during expeditions, particularly the burning brand which preserves the fire, whilst the husband remains free, ready to take advantage of every occasion the chase offers. When the children are old enough, the boys accompany their father on the chase and learn from him the ways of

gaining their subsistence, whilst the girls aid their mother in the care of the household. The polygamous household is less exemplary, even when the husband is more particularly devoted to one of his wives. His wives rather resemble servants, and the children are less kindly treated. The paternal affection, as in the lion which we have described, does not exist at birth. At this moment the father frequently commits, without the least tinge of emotion, acts of infanticide, either as an economical measure, or because the child is weak or malformed. But when the child has once been accepted, he readily yields to its smiles, caresses it, plays with it, loves it, and carefully discharges all his duties. As to the maternal instinct, it is upon the whole as strongly developed as in the animals, and if at times the mother assists with dry eyes in the execution of her child, the case is rare. Were there not even among the animals examples of unnatural instincts of this character?

The family state is without the least doubt the first pseudo-social phase of man. Families are independent. Each seeks in its own behalf to satisfy the needs of common existence. They are nomads in the good seasons, changing their localities according to their needs in search for food. They sleep and sojourn for longer or shorter periods of time in the places they happen to come into, be it in the hollows of rocks, as did the cynocephali of our last article, or in cavities which they dig, or in huts which they construct from branches. When they meet neighboring families they chat and play together for several days, if their stock of provisions permit it, then they leave each other, each going his own way in search of food. In the bad season they seek slightly better quarters in caves which they know, the different families being installed near each other, provided the conditions of the habitation permit it, yet still having separate and independent lodges.

But the families grow. The boys having reached the age of puberty are solicited by new sensations and roaming about more or less in the surrounding territory they meet the daughters of other families. It is the free love of the young. But some day the youths feel the desire to have a family for themselves. They get married as we have described above, and sometimes proceed to found a

new family, or sometimes remain with their wife and children with their old family, which is thus increased. The families which above accidentally met and stopped to enjoy life together for a while, were likely allies by blood. Sooner or later these intermittent associations become more frequent and prolonged. The company of one is sought more and more by the others, and individual bonds of friendship are established. Circumstances present themselves where they are directly in need of one another's services, either for a general battle or for attacking some large animal. The social habit is thus created in the same way as we have seen it rise among the birds and the mammals. And from this results the primitive or family clan, by two processes: (1) by the direct growth of the family, the children, brothers, and sisters continuing to centre about the oldest father, who naturally becomes the chief; (2) by the spontaneous association of different families living isolated in small groups and forming gradually a general coherent group of relationships of all degrees, even very remote. This is the first phase of social evolution, the family clan.

We have seen that among the animals personal property, family property, and communal property exist. The individual is here master of his prey, of his cave, of his female, and of his young. Some couples establish themselves on the shores of a lake in some rocky or grassy nook and defend its approaches against their fellows. Some bands appropriate a part of a forest or swamp land, or take possession of an entire country, and forbid other bands, like the *Cynocephali* from entering it. Among the very low savages, personal property always exists. Each is the owner of his own prey, subject to the restriction of dividing it upon his return and in the expectation that on the morrow his fellow-hunters will divide their share with him. He is the owner of the beehives which he has discovered and which he marks (a mark always respected), of the weapons which he has manufactured, and of the wife whom he has taken under his care. There is no question of family property at first; there is room for all, and the chosen camp whither they return for the bad season is respected just as is the territory where each family is wont to hunt, all by a sort of tacit agreement without the

interchange of a word. When families unconsciously joined in clans, the merging of property-rights must have been spontaneously effected. The family property of cave or hut was confirmed, the territories of chase became the general property of the clan; agriculture not yet existing, there was no necessity of reserving much ground about each habitation. In sum, it was an ideal life, as Rousseau surmised. If it be admitted that such was the life of the primitive family clan, in nature essentially patriarchal, the question arises, How long did it last? Undoubtedly very long. As long as men were few in number, the means of subsistence easy, and the passions of the members restricted to the clan itself.

But a day came when the population waxed great, when the members of a neighboring clan encroached upon territorial property consecrated by time, when the young men impelled by the attraction of novelty carried away by persuasion or force the women of another clan, when accidents, quarrels, and deaths resulted, when the neighboring clan assumed the right of appropriating a more favored country, etc. Then hostilities broke out, reprisals became rife, and a transitory or permanent state of war succeeded, tacit or declared. At the start, when the allied families who formed the clan were still scattered about in small groups, each defending itself after its own fashion, and without preconcerted plans, the father commanded his children and connexions. By force of circumstances, and from having been brought more closely together, some one gave utterance to some advice, showed himself more capable and more brave, and spontaneously assumed the direction of operations. Necessarily he thenceforward preserved some influence in the clan. Later when an attack was repeated and the families were more coherent, some *head-man* was named. The danger past, his powers ceased, but his influence persisted. They selected him as a judge when difficulties and quarrels were to be composed, but without granting to him the right of punishing, which was left to the council of the fathers or elders. Subsequently the nominated chief came into possession of the whole authority, which he partly shared with the council, and with one of those personages who rise so

promptly in primitive human societies, the medicine-man or sorcerer.

The first effect of such hostilities was the tightening of the communal bonds and the awakening of the sentiments of solidarity and of general interest. Each came to understand that it was above all necessary to defend the territory from which he drew his subsistence, that the cause of each was the cause of all. In the homes, nothing was changed. The fathers remained masters of their families, each responsible for the conduct of his own, punishing them at will without heed of others. But towards strangers special customs were formed. Latent evil dispositions were roused, perfidy, theft, bloodshed arose. To do harm to an enemy was an act of merit, a claim to glory. The ambition of the young entering the life of the adult is to become distinguished in this direction, to show to those whom they wish to attract that they are strong and perfectly able to defend themselves. Thenceforth the family clan becomes a political clan. It is concentrated and organised with a view to preserving its integrity as opposed to strangers. This is the first stage of the second phase of social evolution. To become complete it must be organised within, which is the second stage.

The immediate effect, we have said, of having to defend oneself is the strengthening of the bonds of the clan ; the second is to alter its customs. The evil dispositions which war awakened, the resulting reprisals and accustomedness to shedding blood has transformed the character of man, who is now no longer the gentle, simple being of the ancient days, accommodating himself to all things and content with his lot, but has grown less patient and more impulsive in the evil sense. His horizon has been enlarged, he thinks more, his character is less frank, he is more active and more turbulent. The inevitable quarrels between the members of the different families grow more frequent, and compel the fathers of the families to interfere. Women are at first the most common cause of dissensions. The senses are not guided by reason, the youth and even the young married men covet the wife or daughter of their neighbor ; yet though there is still no civil constitution among savages, marriage is none the less a contract, the woman is the

property of the man, and he will suffer no one to touch her without his consent.

On the other hand the clan is increased, either by the multiplication of the various branches of the initial family or by the admission of strangers or the acquisition of servants. The individuals crowd each other more and more ; where there is room for few, it is uncomfortable for many ; life grows annoying, each one is inconvenienced ; separation and a consequent division of labor set in. Some devote themselves especially to the chase or to fishing, others to the manufacturing of arms and of canoes, others to protecting the women and children. Private property is extended to a larger number of objects, to ornaments, to household utensils, and to dwelling places, crude as these still are. They steal without constraint and even as a point of honor from the enemy ; but they do not steal from their own clan—although of course there are exceptions. The natural inequalities begin to be felt : one is strong, another is weak ; one is good, another is bad ; one succeeds in the chase, in the manufacture of certain articles, the other does not. Character, aptitudes, intelligence, and tastes differ. Some have more influence, are more readily listened to, and possess greater privileges and distinctions. The contrasts grow, characters become more and more confirmed ; emulation begins ; rivalry and competition follow ; in a word, struggling within the bosom of the clan sets in, with all the secret or pronounced passions which it brings in its train : suspicion, trickery, lying, jealousy, envy, and hate. Crimes and murders occur. Superstition aggravates these tendencies ; some sinister accident, some disease or death is attributed to the wish or intervention of a person of the same or a neighboring clan, and opinion requires that the death so produced shall be avenged by the nearest of kin, by the family, or by the clan entire.

Then, lest quarrels should be perpetuated forever, and the inward as well as the outward security compromised, usages are established. The chief or council of elders intervenes, settles the differences, judges of the crimes, at the same time seeking to satisfy public opinion, and to forestall the repetition of like acts. Punish-

ment is created, compensation for the injury done, reparation by arms, in a word, established rules set forth the relations of the members of the clans to one another, rules which time consecrated.

The second social phase is complete. The clan is politically organised, both as opposed to foes without and as dictated by needs within. Habits have accomplished all. They have become empirically fixed under the influence of necessity, that is to say, of circumstances, and have spontaneously become rules.

The third phase of social evolution is the tribe. At times the clan increased by dividing up into secondary clans, of which the nucleus was a sub-family; at times several clans united, either from friendship or by conquest, and either preserving or losing their relative autonomy. Subsequently the tribes themselves united, thus forming federations or nations. Thenceforward the resulting concatenation of interests grows more and more complex; customs multiply in divergent senses, some dictated by conscious motives of utility, others by empiricism, many by superstition. The clans or groups come together from time to time, either for concerted action or for amusement, such as dancing and singing together—for example, the Australian *corroborees*. Ceremonies and rites are established with respect to the various stages of life, birth, puberty, marriage, and death. Rules regulating the chase, the gathering of fruits and roots are instituted. A frequent form of regulation is the taboo, that is to say, the forbidding of certain things to be done at certain times, or the eating of certain foods. Each family, clan, or tribe, has its totems, that is to say, its means of recognition, the symbols about which it rallies. Individuals have marks or insignia connecting them with the group to which they belong. They tatoo or brand themselves on different parts of their bodies.

The forms of government vary; the most frequent is the democratic form. A council formed of the fathers, elders, or the most conspicuous, exists in each fraction of the tribe, just as a general council exists for the whole tribe. At times, however, the chiefs or chief rules supreme. There are customs distinguishing each single group, and common customs connecting the general interests of



all. There is rarely pronounced agreement. The higher customs relate more frequently to religion. Punishments are most frequently fines administered in kind, and sometimes consist in corporal inflictions, slavery, or death. Property is divided into personal, family, and communal. The first, and particularly the second, have been extended ; the third is the rule, but often with reservation of certain rights for the benefit of certain families and concerning especially the ground about the dwelling-place. We regret we cannot enter into details. We had intended to give here, as an example of the daily life of the first state of this phase, a *résumé* of the excellent work of Mr. Brough Smith on the Australian aborigines of Victoria, and for the advanced stage, a description of the life of the Indian of the United States in general. But we must renounce this plan as requiring too much space. The greatest number of problems which ethnology and sociology are now concerned with, bear upon this third phase. Here, from lack of written documents, inquirers are obliged to seek the connexion of manners, characters, institutions, and ideas entirely by observation, the method of survivals, and logic. We shall revert to some of these problems.

The fourth phase is that of nationalities, that is to say, of federations of tribes or groups of tribes having a central authority, or of political unifications of tribes or of peoples under the sceptre of one monarch, one oligarchy, or even a single democratic representation. The nationalities which we know of, belong to history. They appear in the New World with the empires of Peru, of Central America, and Mexico, and in the Old World with the empires of China, Babylon, Nineveh, and Egypt. They are continued by the Greek municipalities and the Roman Empire, and form a series extending, but little interrupted, to the states of modern times.

The fifth phase would be the present epoch characterised by the tendency to substitute for empiricism in the organisation of societies, the rational and scientific method.

Let us revert to some of the points of the preceding tableau. It involves, as might be expected, many variants, particularly in the third phase.

Our point of departure was man in favorable circumstances, when his character had not yet been falsified. He was kind, gentle, straightforward, disposed to altruism, resembling rather the herbivorous than the omnivorous animals. The Veddahs are typical of this state, then the Andamans. The Bushmen of the time of Levaillant, and the Fuegian Yahgans in unfavorable conditions, are already less simple and candid. I should like to stop an instant at the Esquimaux. They are situated in the worst possible circumstances, in the midst of ice, in a country without vegetation and extremely poor in alimentary resources. But having no competition the Esquimaux has remained kind, frank, and affectionate to his wife, children, and fellows. Although he formerly occupied more favored southern countries, although he occupied a certain rank in the social scale, had chiefs and tribal divisions, possessed beliefs and legends of distant migrations; although he was intelligent, ingenious, possessed of initiative, acuteness, and a pronounced taste for poetry and song, he is to-day in the lowest phase of social evolution, in the primitive patriarchal phase, without a trace of political organisation. The few traits of advanced civilisation which Mr. Franz Boas and others have described among the Esquimaux, are merely survivals. The explanation suggests itself. We have here the type of the human group of which we have spoken, a type not arrested in its evolution, but retrograded from lack of excitation. Its character affords the key. The Esquimau is apathetic, without reaction, resigned, living from day to day, and without light for half of the year. One is astonished even that he has not passed by adaptation to the state of the hibernating animal. Yet the retrogression has not necessarily affected all the characters and is due to different causes. A tribe of Indians, which Brinton cites, the Snakes, although belonging to a race which had probably raised itself to a higher plane than the ancient Esquimaux, has yet fallen back, from economical motives, to the family phase, without the slightest trace of political organisation. This is another example of retrogression reproducing the phases through which progression passed.

Let us pass to another subject. The long chapter which we devoted to the animal family and which called forth an exposition of the relations of the latter to animal society seems to demand of us a like chapter upon the human family. But numerous works have been published upon this subject, of which the latest expresses perfectly the general ideas to which we ourselves had arrived.<sup>1</sup> We shall consequently be brief.

The initial type of the human family, such as it appears in an analysis of our knowledge of the lowest savages and such as it certainly was with primitive man, is not a promiscuity as has been affirmed but appears just as we have above depicted it. It conforms to what the animals and particularly the apes and the anthropoids led us to expect. Writers have confounded free love outside of marriage with marriage consecrated by formal contract. The family is most commonly monogamous, sometimes polygamous, always patriarchal. The authority in the hands of the father here supplants every other form of social organisation. The father is absolute master, is responsible for all his dependents and punishes them at will. His children bear his name and inherit his property. His authority is generally mild. He voluntarily consults his daughter when he gives her in marriage, sometimes too, his wife. He is not tyrannical. If he takes to himself several wives, one is particularly favored and is his principal spouse. Later when the elder and younger branches have separated or have become subdivided, each father preserves his rights over his own, but the father of the elder acquires a higher authority over the others. Thenceforth two cases are presented. Either the family maintains its primitive form, whatever be the extent of the clan, becoming even more consolidated, as we shall soon see ; or, becoming subject to the predominant influence of the clan or the new usages which that gives rise to, it enters upon a deviating course of development of the most unexpected kind.

---

<sup>1</sup> Westermarck, *The History of Human Marriage*, London, 1891. I could not be too profuse in my commendation of this work. The bibliography with which it closes is admirably complete.

Let us begin with the first case which will oblige us to anticipate a subject which we did not wish to approach until later.

Among the sentiments which animals, for example the elephant, the dog, or the ape suddenly manifest in the presence of a new or extraordinary fact or object, are to be successively noted astonishment, curiosity, and the desire of getting clear as to its character, and, finally, when unsuccessful in this, fear and terror. Such is the case of the dog who seeing the portrait of his master on the wall, stops, looks at it, barks, then flees, returns, barks anew, and retires confounded and with lowered head. Such also is the case of the ape who, seeing his reflexion in a glass, looks around him, seeks to comprehend the situation, and at the close of his efforts runs away, casting glances of distrust behind him. It is the same with man. In the presence of the phenomena of nature and of objects which arrest his attention—the sun rising and setting each day, the lightning cleaving the clouds, the stone which has struck him—he is disturbed and restless, inquires what it means, and receiving no response makes of it, with that faculty which the dog and ape do not possess, a being endowed with life like himself, a supernatural thing. Thence he comes to regard that thing as a fetish, to convert it into a charm against bad luck, to commend himself to it, to address prayers to it. This is the first stage of human belief and sprang from fear, as Petronius has said. Like the child who strikes the object that has injured him, only going farther still, he attributes to objects intentions and an imaginary anthropomorphic power.

The second stage is that in which by mimicking further the resemblance to himself he gives to objects a spirit, a double, distinct from the object itself. This is the animism of Tylor. The savage has remarked that there are in him two beings, the one attending to the ordinary occupations of life and periodically slumbering, the other pursuing him in his dreams, and when awake forcing him often to do deeds which he cannot resist, or revealing itself in conditions which to-day we call pathological. His imagination is struck with the phenomenon and carries him still farther. Not being able to believe in natural and complete death, not being

able to believe that the friend with whom he has lived, the father who has cared for him, has totally disappeared, he supposes that his double continues to exist, that it has made a voyage or excursion in his environment and is still concerned about him. This double he sees with the same needs, the same desires, and the same exigencies as formerly. If something incomprehensible happens to him he attributes it to his double, imagines it irritated. Hence the obligations which he believes he is under to it—first, that of properly interring it with victuals, with arms, and the things which it loved most, then that of renewing these victuals and of making oblations and even sacrifices to it.

Frequently matters go no farther, the recollection of the father is effaced and *a fortiori* of the grandfather, and all those who have preceded him. But at times and that among a great number of savages these oblations are prolonged and frequently even in some of a more advanced state are confirmed and give rise to the cult of manes or ancestors which assumes considerable importance and engenders in the bosom of societies of which these families form part, powerful autonomies.

The eldest son, and, when there are several branches, the oldest in the branch, then the oldest among the survivors, has charge of the offerings and periodical ceremonies in honor of the ancestors. The spot where the latter repose becomes a sacred locality; the dwelling in which they have lived is sacred also. The enclosure where both are situated, marked off by boundaries or stones, becomes the common patrimony, which the eldest responsible son manages in the name of all and is bound to transmit intact or augmented to his descendants. An altar is erected in the habitation, where the fire, at first intermittent, is afterwards made permanent. Rites are established in which the whole family take part and from which the uninitiated are excluded. The son who is in charge of these rites is a veritable pontiff. He wields at once a patriarchal and religious authority over all the members of the family, now become a clan, not excepting the servants and the few strangers who have been admitted into its bosom after complying with certain requirements.

The bonds thus established between ascendants and descendants are mutual. The ancestors cannot dispense with the cult which is due to them. If the family becomes extinct, the common sepulchre no longer has any one to care for it and to celebrate its rites, the manes of the ancestors are cast off and condemned to wander about perpetually. It is to the interest of the latter, therefore, to protect their posterity. Thus the perpetuation of him who has charge of the rites is a paramount consideration. He is obliged to marry, to have children of the masculine sex, to divorce or to take to himself another wife if the necessity arises, to adopt a stranger as his son in the last emergency, in a word, to maintain his line of descent. There are even more extraordinary measures still adopted to stave off the consequences of sterility. In all this the woman does not count. On entering a family she is initiated into its mysteries and renounces that which she has quitted. She assists in its ceremonies, but that is all. Inheritance from one branch to another operates only through the masculine sex.

How extensively is this eminently conservative institution spread? If we examine it closely, we shall find traces of it in a great number of peoples. It existed and exists still in China where formerly the Chinese called themselves "the people of the hundred families" or clans, where the family is still organised upon that basis, under the high authority of the father, with the sanction of the domestic gods.<sup>1</sup> Villages are mentioned here of three thousand souls, forming but a single family. The institution also existed among the Hebrews. The clan of Abraham is a perfect example of it. It existed in India and in all branches, it seems, of the Aryan race, notably in Rome and in Greece where it has been described in a masterly manner by Fustel de Coulanges.<sup>2</sup>

At a distant epoch of history several of these clans or gentes became united, and without losing any of their several characters formed phratries or curiæ, which adopted as their principal common divinity the most renowned and powerful of the clan. But let us

---

<sup>1</sup> Eugène Simon, *La Cité Chinoise*. Paris, 1885.

<sup>2</sup> Fustel de Coulanges, *La Cité Antique*. Thirteenth edition. Paris, 1890.

take an example from Fustel de Coulanges,—the most celebrated one. Centuries before Athens existed, Attica was occupied by upwards of a hundred independent family clans, each having its chief or pontiff, its domestic gods, one or two usually, and its “clients.” Three, four, or six of these clans united and came to form twelve phratries or boroughs. One of these, the Cecropids, inhabited the rock where later the Parthenon was erected, and towards the sixteenth century before our era acquired the supremacy. One day a Cecropid named Theseus succeeded in consolidating the twelve boroughs, and with the assistance of the patricians, or Eupatrids, founded the city of Athens. But this centralisation gave rise to distrust of the patricians, a struggle ensued, the religious and political offices which had been united in one person were severed, the family organisation began to give way, the “clients” were freed, the plebs, that is to say, all persons not included in the organisation, came to the fore, and in Solon’s time the organisation itself disappeared. At Rome its history is virtually the same; and no traces of it are found in the laws of Justinian. The right of primogeniture which has persisted in Anglo-Scandinavian societies is its survival.

The second case presented in the primitive paternal family is its deviation under the growing predominant influence of the enlarged clan. This deviation is a step backwards to the less developed family state in evolution, which we met with in the animals and which implies a varying disinterestedness on the part of the male in his family duties. The children are here left to the care of the mother, we have the maternal family.

We have seen that the maternal instinct is one of the most beautiful products of evolution in the birds and mammals, that it is free from all impurity and strongly consolidated, whilst the paternal instinct is an unstable compound involving several elements, one altruistic and the other egoistic, and that the latter frequently gains the upper hand. It is the same in the human species. Of the two needs which assure reproduction, the one, the sexual need, has remained imperious in man, the other, the family need, is subordinated to certain satisfactions, to certain influences. When the

family is small, isolated, in a calm environment, and when its monogamous altruism preserves its entire hold upon the husband, the wife is his companion and the children his source of joy. But when the responsibility of the husband is less engaged, when he is accustomed to regard his wife as a utility, when he becomes polygamous, and when a different interest, that which he has in the clan, distracts his attention from his family interests proper, his paternal interest weakens and gets disorganised. He behaves as does the buffalo, who is more at his ease with his comrades in the herd at large than with his females and young in his own particular herd. Of two things, one happens. If he is eldest in the multiple family of which he forms part, his need of domination is largely satisfied to the detriment of his family. If he is a subordinate, his dominion over his wife or wives and his children is lessened; he takes less interest in the performance of his duties, and gradually comes to see in his wife nothing but a means of pleasure and a breeder of children.

Such is for us the point of departure of the secondary formation of the maternal family in the human species. It is met with here and there in Asia, in the Malay Archipelago, in Polynesia, in Africa, and especially in America. It is in concord with polyandry, which is a plurality of husbands, with polygamy, or monogamy.

An early form particularly noticed in Tibet among the Todas, among the primitive Arabs and the ancient Bretons, is fraternal polyandry, which forms the passage from the paternal to the maternal form. The oldest member of one clan takes a wife from a stranger clan, who subsequently becomes the wife of his other brothers and of their nearest relatives. The first pays at the outset the entire dower for which the others afterwards reimburse him, each according to his share. The causes of this institution rest on considerations of economy, the scarcity of women, or the advantage arising from the concentration of heritages in a single family. Nevertheless, the Toda who can afford a wife all to himself, never lacks one.

Another form of which the Nairs of Malabar are the type, is as follows: the woman remains at home and accepts from the



hands of her relatives from four to twelve husbands, provided they are of the same caste, who jointly supply her needs. In this case the children never know who is their father and can only bear the name of their mother, whilst in the preceding case they had a collective paternity of the same name. What complicates the situation in the case of the Nairs is, that each of the husbands can enter into other conjugal relations of the same kind.

The third is one of the forms of marriage preserved in the Malay Archipelago. The woman remains in the family of her mother where she is engaged in its management. The husband lives and works in the family of his mother. The father is a nearer relative of the members of his maternal family than he is of his own children. The maternal uncle is the chief of the family ; lacking him, the eldest son, if he is old enough ; lacking both, the mother. The father does not officiate until the mother is dead, and then only while the children are minors.

Other forms are more widely spread, but are extremely variable. In Australia and America they are almost in proportion to the paternal family. Between them and the latter Tylor admits an intermediary form, the paterno-maternal. The custom of the husband to take his wife to his home, or of going to live in her home or with her clan, gives us an insight into the origin of the maternal family. It appears from the statistics of Tylor that in the tribes where the custom is for the woman to come to the house of the man, the system of calling children by the name of their father is constant ; that in the tribes where the husband goes to the house of the wife, the system of giving the name of the mother is proportionally frequent ; and that in those where both usages exist, the children bear the name of the father when the mother goes to the father's house, and that of the mother when the father dwells with the mother. In Australia, the chief of the maternal family is now the maternal uncle and now and most frequently the father, although by law the children are dependent on the clan of the wife. Inheritance goes now by the wife and now by the husband, especially certain articles such as those which belong to the soil. On the other hand, sometimes the boys bear the name of their father

and the girls that of their mother. As we see, we have here an institution imperfectly established, of which the origin at the expense of the paternal family is evident, and which customs, accidentally created, have caused to deviate from its natural type.

In America the institution is more consolidated. Let us take the Iroquois for example. The children bear the name of their mother. If the husband dies, his goods are divided among his brothers, sisters, and brothers of his mother; his children receive nothing. If the wife dies her goods are divided among her children and her sisters; her brothers are excluded. It is the mother who grants the hand of her daughters and who seeks wives for her sons. The Iroquois are monogamous, polygamy is forbidden to the men, but in a tribe cited by Lafitau the woman can take a second husband. The family thus constituted is the nucleus of a social organisation which recalls that based upon the paternal family and consolidated by the worship of ancestors. Twenty to twenty-five families compose a clan, of which all the members are solidary, which has a common sepulchre, its own totem, is governed by a council, lives in a common "long house" and is exogamous. Three, four, five, of these clans get grouped into phratries, the latter into tribes, the latter into confederations. Each tribe has its own totem, the individuals are exogamous with regard to the clan, and endogamous with regard to the tribe.

Does the maternal family imply the matriarchate, that is, the transfer of the authority of the household from the hands of the father to the hands of the mother? By no means. There is a division of the authority here between the father, the chief of the maternal family, and, in the case of the Iroquois at least, the mother. All things considered, the woman is the gainer. Her responsibility with regard to her children is augmented, as is also her social position. In several tribes of America she is consulted and can be the chief. The women come together in council and send a delegate to the council of the men. Among the Iroquois she is said to have had the right of veto in declarations of war, and could intervene for restoring peace. (Schoolcraft.)

In fine, the complete characters of the maternal family in its

most widely spread forms are as follows: (1) the mother is directly responsible for her children and is slightly assisted by her husband; (2) the children bear the name of the mother; (3) the system of relationship is entirely altered, and, from our point of view, eccentric; (4) the property of the mother is left to her children and to her nearest maternal relatives, and, *vice versa*, the nephews and nieces inherit the property and dignities of the maternal uncle; (5) the latter, save in the case where, as among the Iroquois, the woman plays the chief rôle, is vested with the general authority, receiving offers of marriage for the daughters or even accepting the dower which he divides with the father; (6) the maternal clan is jointly responsible for the children, avenging them when necessary, while the latter, in case of war, are obliged to rally in its defence; (7) the father acts a secondary and extremely trifling rôle.

A curious and universal fact, varying in degree, but found in all forms of marriage, is the interdiction of union between near relatives, at first between father and mother and the children (here Westermarck cites but one exception, that of the Kaniagmuts) then between brothers and sisters, between uncles or aunts, and nieces or nephews, then between cousins of the first and second degree, and subsequently even further still. When the interdiction applies to all the members of a clan regarded as of kin, although the kinship has been lost in the lapse of time, the clan is called exogamous. In certain clans of Australia this fictitious kinship is expressed in the habit of all its members calling one another brother and sister. It has been sought to penetrate the motive of the interdiction of union between relatives. None of the five or six opinions which have been advanced are completely satisfactory. Nothing corresponds to it among the animals.

The meaning of the customs consecrating marriage has also been investigated. In general the young man seeks his own wife and the girl waits until she is asked, as is the custom to-day. At first, the marriage was effected entirely without formality, as we have already seen. The request having been made of the father, and his consent obtained, the young couple depart with full knowl-

edge of the engagements which they have entered upon ; protection and the satisfaction of their needs by the one, submission and fidelity by the other. In a second phase the fiancé carries off his bride by violence after having obtained her consent and that of her parents, and rarely without that consent. Generally it is a sham struggle, a simple ceremony, though at times brutal survivals of it are found in modern civilisation. It is marriage by capture. The third phase is marriage by purchase, in which the price of the bride is regulated by usage, varies with the standing of the family, or is chaffered about. The price may be another girl in exchange for another young man, services rendered by the suitor, objects, such as one or two buffaloes, or a sum of current money. The fourth system is exchange between the father and the suitor, each one giving. The fourth, which is doubtless derived from the latter, is marriage with dower, which constitutes the personal belongings of the woman. Marriage by capture is most debated. For us, setting aside the facts of stealing in a hostile or friendly tribe, it is simply a representation of what takes place in animals, and which we find again in man. The male animal desirous of conquering a female, approaches the latter, gives exhibitions of his force, and shows himself ready to combat all his rivals. The female affects timidity, resists, and does not abandon herself until the male has offered her violence. This is what we still see to-day in our towns, and in the country with civilised man ; the woman who is most disposed to yield is the one who most resists.

It is unnecessary to indicate the numerous exceptional forms which marriage presents among savages and half-civilised people, such as marriages by trial, after which trial the girl accepts or refuses a suitor as is the custom with the Todas ; the marriages which are not definitive until after the conception or birth of a child, or which are broken if children are not born ; marriages for a fixed space of time, etc. The latter already falls under the rubric of licentiousness or prostitution, which we should be on our guard against confounding with hospitable, religious, and seignorial prostitution, of which we shall not speak.

The genetic instinct and the family instinct, although often su-

perposed, are not necessarily associated in marriage, of which the object is less to satisfy the sensual impulses of the husband than to establish a home and to have children. In the most felicitous unions, the genetic instinct of the husband, being more imperative than that of the wife, is not always satisfied at certain periods of the life of the mother (gestation, lactation, etc.). When custom and his position in life permit it, he takes to himself a second wife, and, caprice intervening, perhaps a third ; or he is, by permission of law, polygamous. But if that is not allowable he will either give vent to his impulses elsewhere, or will take to his home a concubine, which public opinion also frequently permits. As to the women, the genetic instinct very frequently leads them astray, even before marriage. The best behaved girls, so a missionary in Lower California recounts, languish after a husband. The first step is the gravest. They contract what they represent to be a marriage for a period fixed in advance at one year, at several months, or less, or for certain days of the week. Marriage of this sort thus leads by degrees to prostitution or concubinage with which among the savages or barbarians in a clan or tribe are associated all those variations of the sexual relations which are more or less accepted by usage. If we add polyandry and polygamy between two neighboring clans, we arrive at those irregular customs which are attributed to savages and among others to those assumed promiscuities, "marriages by groups" which figured in ethnography not many years ago.

Inquirers have been fain to see in this promiscuity, which is associated with complete anarchy, the first stage of man prior to the appearance of society : the political clan emerging from this anarchy, the maternal family issuing from this clan, and the paternal family proceeding from the latter. This is erroneous. The paternal family was the immediate, habitual form of association of the true primitive man as it is now among the lowest savages we know of. The family clan, afterwards political, is most commonly nothing but an enlarged family. When these clans are united into phratries and tribes, the family still persisted with its primitive patriarchal organisation. The maternal family is an accident only, a retro-

gression, which has drawn evolution into a devious way. Yet in this form it has remained none the less the fundamental element of the clans or tribes in which it existed.

Similarly polyandry and also polygamy are accidents, reversions to animal forms of marriage, aberrations of the human species. The advanced and essentially human form is monogamy, either express or concealed under different forms. Westermarck justly remarks that if one of the women in polygamy is the spouse *par excellence*, in polyandry one of the men, too, is the preferred husband. Even in the midst of licentious debauchery, as we find it among the Areois of Tahiti, each man has his own wife, of whom he is jealous and with whom he is very strict. Even in prostitution the woman contracts an alliance with some one man particularly, and makes of him her companion and protector. Monogamy is the conjugal form of the anthropoid apes, as of the lowest savages. In the first phases of civilisation it drops off in frequency, but only to increase again at a more advanced stage and to become the accepted and esteemed form. Furthermore, it is the form to which the paths followed by evolution in the animal scale logically led—the form which answers physiologically the best to the objects of reproduction : not quantity but quality of children.

\* \* \*

The forms or types which human society affect or have affected, from the epoch of the family or family clan to modern civilisations, are so numerous and varied that the first thing to be done, in acquiring a satisfactory point of view, is the establishment of divisions beginning with the simplest and leading to the most complex, in conformity with the principle of evolution or of their progression towards societies which we esteem to be the highest, that is to say, towards our own.

The most desirable classification, that towards which all our efforts tend, and which takes into account all the characters presented, rests upon the idea of civilisation itself. It would be something as follows: the very lowest savages, such as the Veddahs; the semi-savages, such as the Australians; the barbarians of the first, second, or third degree, as the negroes of Dahomey and of

Benin, the Indians at the time of the discovery of America ; the Kalmucks of Tartary, the Gauls and Visigoths ; the semi-civilised peoples, such as the ancient Egyptians and Assyrians, the Peruvians of Pizarro, and the Mexicans of Cortez ; and the civilised peoples, which are divided into the Ancients (the Greeks and Romans), and into the Moderns. But on the one hand science is not in a position to fill up the details of these divisions, and on the other their lines of demarcation are not at all distinctly fixed : there are everywhere insensible gradations.

A second classification is that which we have sketched out above, based upon the idea of association : families uniting into clans, clans into phratries or tribes, tribes into cities or their equivalent, and cities into federations and nations.

The third mode rests upon the first manifestations of the faculties that constitute man. The making of tools for attack and defence, at first worked in stone by chipping, cleavage, or polishing, then in copper, bronze, or iron. The age of fire-arms should be added. It is unnecessary to say that the resulting periods are nowise parallel in the different parts of the globe, in Italy and in France, in Europe and in America. Quite recently the tribes of Lower California were still in the stone age.

The fourth mode of division is based upon the manner in which men in societies, as they increase in number and encounter greater and greater difficulties in supplying their daily needs, organise their life either by *transforming* their present means of satisfying these needs, or by *adding* to those which they already employ, entirely new methods.

Other modes of division have been suggested giving rise to other social types, but not harmonising with the general idea of unbroken progression in the same direction. Such is the division of tribes and peoples into nomadic and sedentary, into peaceful and warlike, into monarchic, oligarchic, and democratic, into individualistic and autocratic, two forms compatible with each of the three preceding.

Let us dwell on the fourth mode, which is the broadest. The lowest savages, who are broken up into small families, are either

hunters or fishers, according to the country of which they have virtual ownership, or they are both at once. They are nomads, always in search of food, as long as the season permits it. At a certain season of the year, the Veddahs are shut in by the rains, the country is inundated, and the various families seek a refuge on some rocky eminence, where they come together but do not indiscriminately mingle. Sometimes one of them will volunteer at the peril of his life to go in search of food, which, if he finds, he will divide. This is the first stage of the first period or of the hunter type. The necessity of finding certain species of game or fish on the territory of certain families was perhaps one of the first occasions of reunion and of the granting of concessions after the manner of an association. The second stage of the hunter or fisher type is found in savages already organised into clans or tribes. It is characterised by a spirit of foresight and conservation which is quite remarkable. Rules are established for the protection of useful animals and plants; hunting at the time of mating and flowering is prohibited in certain regions; general expeditions are made at certain times only. The Americans of to-day evince nothing like a similar foresight when they suffer their forests to be burned and devastated,—forests which even now are in many places utterly shorn of their most beautiful original species.

The second period is that in which man, seeing his customary game diminish as the number of hunters increases, and under the pressure of hunger, takes a step farther in the direction of foresight, gathers together in some enclosure the animals which form his customary food, subjects them to domestication, or leads them in herds to the pastures which they successively exhaust. This is the pastoral period which has persisted to our day among a great many peoples and which is essentially a nomadic stage.

The third period, which frequently sets in at the same time with the preceding, is that wherein man applies himself to agriculture. Two forms are met with here. In the one the culture of the soil is intermittent; man plows and sows, pastures his flocks while living a nomad life, and then returns to the tilling of the soil. In the other, man is sedentary; he inhabits houses with his wife and



children, who assist him, or he dwells in villages. This kind of life is eminently favorable on the one hand to the patriarchal family grouped about its patrimony and consolidated or not by the worship of ancestors, and on the other, to individual property spontaneously created at the outset by simply taking possession of, breaking, and working undisputed land. In primitive societies which devote themselves to agriculture, there is generally collective property of the soil vested in the clan which sometimes culminates in the periodical distribution of lands not reserved; there is also family property, included in the preceding, being the outcome of family labor, and being handed down from generation to generation according to certain rules; and finally there is personal property. In our modern societies the state is still theoretically the owner of the soil, it takes possession of it again whenever it wants to for reasons of public utility. For a long time the cultivation of the soil was not held in high repute, the profession of the hunter or warrior was a far nobler one as affording evidence of the individual valor of man. Later, even in civilised nations, it was voluntarily entrusted to slaves. In Athens, the laboring class was among the lowest. This way of looking at things has changed since schools of economy have taught us that the goods of the earth are the source of all true riches.

The fourth period, or fourth type, did not assume importance until later, but it has its roots in the first phases of society. Exchange does not exist among animals, and is one of the precocious manifestations of the human mind. It is discovered during the second stone epoch in France. It is derived from the obtrusive fact which spontaneously came to notice, that one individual excels in the making of instruments, another in the chase or in fishing. The first says: "Give me what thou hast, and I will give thee what I have." This is barter or exchange in kind. Shortly after the first rejoins, "Do thou go and hunt for me, and while absent I will protect thy family." We have here exchange of services. This phenomenon takes place in the clan or tribe. Later, certain individuals, adopting definitively this kind of specialisation of labor, set out on voyages in quest of the scarcest materials, and con-

sequently those most in demand, for example, good flints which are easily worked, shells for ornamentation, cattle, etc. The distribution of such objects was not always easy. Some one would want something and would have nothing to give in return that the other needed. The needs of the day and the morrow varied. Some conventional object of value was then adopted as a medium of exchange, such as cattle, tobacco, wampum. The latter, being more portable, became the current money, and afterwards was succeeded by pieces of metal and letters of exchange. Little by little the individuals seeking their subsistence from this species of labor multiply, and the advancement of navigation widely extended their sphere. An entire nation, the Phœnicians, abandoned themselves passionately to its pursuit. With them the *commercial* type was born, that is to say, a society not exclusively devoted to this kind of work, but associating it preponderantly with other means of satisfying the national needs. In the same perfection this type is not found until centuries afterwards in the Jews of the Middle Ages, and in the Hanseatic and Italian ports.<sup>1</sup>

As to the fourth period, or the fourth type, its roots are more deeply embedded in the past of man, but it does not attain an advanced stage until after the preceding period. It is the *industrial* type. The manufacture of stone, bone, and ivory instruments was its first stage, that of household utensils, of jewels, baskets, matted fabrics, and canoes the second stage. More than any other manifestation of the human mind, it reflects the latter's progress in satisfying the needs of daily life. The multiplication of needs which it gives rise to, the comfort which it brings with it, the luxury to which it tends, the need of wealth that results from it, are the most palpable measure of the degree of civilisation attained. There were shops for the manufacture of glass and pottery, for weaving and dyeing in Egypt from the fourth dynasty. The Pompeiian collection of the Museum at Naples shows to what a stage industry had arrived in the first century of our era. The art of war was one of

---

<sup>1</sup> Blanqui, membre de l'Institut, *Histoire de l'économie politique en Europe, depuis les Anciens jusqu'à nos jours*. Paris, two vols. 1860.

its stimulants in all epochs. With printing, steam, and finally with electricity, progress took an accelerated pace. The Museums of Ethnography, like that of the Smithsonian Institute at Washington, and the Polytechnical Museums, like that of Kensington at London, trace backwards its evolution. The history of the industrial social type is divided into two sub-periods: the one in which the individual, having as his sole possession his arms and hands, and still enjoying by virtue of his muscular force high esteem, preserved his relative independence; the second, in which the individual is outstripped and soon afterwards conquered by machinery with which he cannot compete and which, as its powers grow, finally takes his place.

Then appears what we deem necessary to regard as the sixth period, a sixth type, the present, the *intellectual* type. These machines, to say nothing of the science which has created them, are the material incarnation of the intellectual power of man, ultimately gaining the ascendancy over the muscular or animal force of the early ages.

Mind, having been *par excellence* the weapon of man in his struggle against nature, could not help culminating in such supremacy. It is the ultimate term of division and specialisation of labor for the satisfaction of needs of all kinds. The consequence is that the conditions underlying the social relations between man and man have totally changed, and that the great problem of the twentieth century will be that of finding the best adaptations to this new state of things. The twentieth century ought rationally to be the pure reign of intelligence.

It will surprise some, perhaps, that to the six types named, to-wit: hunting, agricultural, pastoral, industrial, commercial, and intellectual, we have not added the military type to which Mr. Herbert Spencer attaches so much importance. Our motives for not having done so are as follows: (1) What gave rise to the six preceding types was the necessity of living, of multiplying or transforming the means before employed in supplying the urgent needs of life. Militarism belongs to an entirely different order of ideas. It grew from the need of defence, and later, in response to other

needs having no relation to necessity. (2) It has existed at all times, parallel with the types cited, save in countries where the topographical characteristics themselves formed a natural defence. (3) It appeared early, was the result of no social type, and engendered none. It varies and is hostile to all the social types. (4) There would be just as much reason in admitting a clerical type, likewise appearing as soon as men united in groups, accompanying all social forms and resulting from a like particular need. (5) Perfectly rational at the start when it was used to defend the home, the clan, the tribe, or to maintain the collective independence of the latter, or even in expeditions into neighboring territories in search of food which was lacking at home, militarism subsequently became the expression of man's desire of dominating, of displaying his power, of satisfying his pride when it was not, even worse still, madness, or sheer debauchery in blood. The six types which we assume, may have their defects by the side of their advantages, but they are certainly a logical consequence of amelioration, stages in the path of social progress, which cannot be said of militarism.

Militarism in its legitimate, primitive form is but a reflex action, the same which impels the frog when deprived of its brain, to contract its leg when pinched, or the lion to throw himself upon the hunter when wounded, or the cercopithecous monkey to organise expeditions into corn fields for the satisfaction of his hunger. The difference in the case of man is that the animal rarely attacks and destroys without necessity, while man ultimately comes to doing so from sheer passion.

The evil in the case of man dates from the day when it was necessary to nominate the chief of a clan, and when the chief in question, together with his followers, saw in war a means of strengthening his position and of becoming powerful. At the start, every man able to handle a weapon was a soldier. Some were brave, others pusillanimous. The first were hailed as heroes on their return, the others were despised. The first necessarily were the recipients of favors, were consulted in council, had the best places reserved for them at the ceremonies, were invested with definitive marks, honors, and privileges. Selection spontaneously set in and

there arose a class of warriors. The warriors multiplying, their importance waxed great, they looked upon themselves as a superior class, treated the rest with disdain, became proud, arrogant, and finally asserted high prerogatives in the conduct of public affairs. Coming to an understanding with the high dignitaries of which they were the pillars, such as the chiefs, the fathers of families and the priests; having the forethought to appropriate the major part of the spoils of war, and consequently increasing in wealth, their influence also increased. The administrators of the state were recruited from their ranks. Gradually they came to look upon the state as their special work, as their peculiar property, and in the laws which they helped to establish they ultimately identified their own interests, whether as a class or as individuals, with the interests of the people. The others below them were humble and subordinate and possessed only nominal importance.

At the origin, war was rational. It subserved the defence of all and was kept within bounds. Savages as a rule never push hostilities beyond the necessary point. The Australians often substituted for it single combat by groups, the conditions being fixed in advance as in a duel. The Tasmanians, when the war was ended, clasped hands and forgot its originating offence. Hostilities were not perpetuated. But when the chiefs whose power sprang from war alone and the professional warriors became the ruling element, peace was often only a truce. Attacks were wilfully made under the pretence of making conquests and establishing empires, nations advanced in hordes in search of new and rich countries, pillaged cities and bore off prisoners of both sexes. Foraging expeditions were converted into outright robbery. War became a lucrative profession, a man-hunt, a royal pleasure, the highest glory.

Thenceforth the populations were divided into conquerors and conquered, within as well as without the city or empire. Every state was divided into two bodies, the slaves and the citizens, distributed into classes. Slavery in all antiquity was a scourge of blood, sometimes dissimulated under highly civilised appearances. Everywhere here, we see men whose only wrong was that they had been unfortunate on the day of combat, valiant men, sound in body and

mind, curbed under the hands of a master, enfeoffed in a society having different manners, a different tongue, frequently different laws, and different gods from their own. I say different laws, but no. For them there were no laws. They had lost all quality of manhood.

Our great modern states, the absolute monarchies, with all their classes of nobles and courtiers, are the product of war. The chiefs divided up the conquered countries among themselves and became so many rivals, disputing for the available spoils. The least happy are the vassals, the happiest the monarch. But the latter having reached his position by war is compelled to maintain it by war. He must encourage the ardor of his partisans, must distribute among them new lands, and shower upon them riches and honor. The property which we saw to be natural in its origin, thus becomes the prey of the strongest. Then feudalism is born. The true society, the society of the workers, disorganised, shattered and perverted in its whole mechanism, thenceforth was left to establish itself as best it could, parts in towns where they established communes and obtained by dint of perseverance guarantees protecting them in their work, and parts in the country under the protection of feudal castles on the lands of the seignors in whose favor they alienated a great part of their liberty for the permission to live.

These times are gone, people say. Militarism has changed their characteristics. But has the change been so great? When war breaks out, is it less horrible in its methods, less sanguinary, does it absorb less of the resources of a country, does it not destroy in less time the fruits of years of labor and saving?

War has not only its evils of the moment, and disasters which are soon repaired; it has also its reactive influence upon morals within. It habituates the minds of people to certain ways of thought it teaches them the law of the strongest, causes man to lose sight of justice, and inculcates that there are two schemes of ethics, that of ends and of success and that of failure. So long as war is not suppressed, the aspirations of philanthropists will be ethereal Utopias. With Mr. Spencer it must be admitted that contemporary militarism, however legitimate (for one nation cannot suffer itself

to be devoured or molested by another), is the grand calamity of the day, the disgrace of humanity, and that in this respect we civilised people do not stand as high as the Veddahs or the Australians.

By the side of militarism, which is an animal manifestation of our organism, still presiding over the relations of peoples to each other and forming an outward evil of society reacting upon it interiorly, there exists another social evil which works wholly within but which is not less grave.

One of the first phenomena which the beginnings of human society present, and which bear some similarity to the formation of animal colonies by associations of merids, is the division and specialisation of labor. This division begins in the family between the husband and the wife ; it is continued in the clan or tribe between individuals ; it becomes established and spreads with the growth of the population and as the means of living become more difficult ; it attains its maximum extent in our present complex civilisation. One of its results is the breaking up of societies into classes and professional groups whose number is constantly increasing. The class which appears first is that of the fathers of families or of the elders on one hand, and of warriors on the other, which by fusion become the superior class, that which the chiefs, the administrators, and the magistrates affect. The sacerdotal class then forms and soon becomes associated with the preceding, which has need of its services in swaying the populace. The third, fourth, and fifth social types which we have described give rise to the following : the agricultural class, the merchant or commercial class, and the artisan or industrial class. The last embraces all that is not included in the five preceding, all those whom the family organisation not having incorporated has left without a home or domestic gods, those who have never been able by perseverance or their own worth or by favoring circumstances to succeed and rise, the day-laborers who live from hand to mouth, the tramps, outcasts, and outlaws. The slaves on the one hand and the strangers on the other, are classes apart. In Athenian times, a while previously to Solon, the proportion of the population was as follows : citizens of

all classes nine per cent.; strangers subject to severe restrictions, eighteen per cent.; slaves, seventy-three per cent. The warrior, magisterial, and priestly classes were the higher classes; the merchants, the artisans, and the agriculturists formed the middle classes; the common laborers, the lower class or plebs. But the division did not terminate here. The middle classes were subdivided into professional groups, such as sedentary or pastoral agriculturists, fishermen, sailors, carpenters, shoemakers, scribes, interpreters, etc. These classes existed virtually as such or they were consecrated by laws; some were closed and hereditary, others open; a person was born, for example, warrior or priest. In Egypt, according to Herodotus, there were five classes, according to Diodorus, seven. But the latter must have confounded classes and professional groups, and then have omitted some of the last. The word "caste" seems to have been reserved for closed groups such as they existed in India.

In India, or, to be more precise, in the Punjab, there were originally, according to the code of Manu, four classes: the Brahmins or priests, the Kshatriyas or warriors, the Vaiçyas or husbandmen, merchants and artisans, and the Çûdras or servants. The aim of this classification was to prevent a mingling of the conquering Aryans with the Dravidians, and consequently the absorption of the former. The first caste was composed of Aryans supposed to be pure, the second of Aryans and Dravidians crossed, the others of Dravidians. The black aborigines were excluded from the classification and bore the name of Pariahs, a term subsequently invented. Afterwards the castes were modified although the first suffered the least. Numerous intermediary castes were engendered, that of the Vaiçyas in particular was divided into a great many sub-corporations, each having its particular customs, laws, and religion, endogamous with respect to themselves, exogamous with respect to one another and then giving rise to other castes. There was, for example, the caste of Kayasthas, or scribes. We have legends concerning its origin, but none of them are trustworthy. It is divided into four sub-castes and each of these into sections, each comprising a certain number of families or family clans. According to the



census of 1881 there were in India two thousand five hundred castes of this kind, not including lesser divisions.

Classes, or open castes, are according to the nature of things, and in themselves no evil. They are a logical stratification. One passes from layer to layer, rises or descends according to one's starting-point and the success or non-success of one's conduct. But this is not the case in closed classes and corporations. When a strong superior authority, special customs, religion, or secular routine have enervated the character and strained the resiliency of individuals, pushed resignation to the point of self-abandonment, then castes become perpetuated with all their faults and merits. They perform their work as the specialisation of labor requires it, but that is all. When on the contrary the individual is active, thinks, desires to be happier, preserves in himself the stimulants that make man, the feeling of solidarity and of general interest is established, aspirations are joined, the caste or corporation becomes an individuality opposed to those of other castes, competition with the latter is aroused and grows great, and at the same time the idea of equality and inequality, the desire of struggling and of having the same enjoyments, the same rights, and of conquering.

It is the war of classes, unknown in India, in Egypt, and in all countries where in the lower states of society the spirit of liberty has faded or never been roused, but frequent in Greece and Rome and in modern civilisations where the general level is higher. When individuals live in contact with one another, are not utterly ignorant of what is going on about them, when they exchange, be it ever so little, their thoughts, which happens in towns more than in the country, especially in the liveliest, the effect is inevitable. The isolated individual is pliant and submissive. Banded together, individuals support one another, lend themselves more easily to enthusiasm, and are ready to follow the most audacious leader. Hence in the lower classes there exists always a latent protest against the inequalities in the distribution of happiness, a silent rancor which the habit of submission can alone suppress. Hence the intermittent explosions of the disinherited classes, the governed against the governing.

The complement of the struggle between classes is that between individuals, to which we shall have too much occasion to revert to insist upon it at the present moment, and which the works of Darwin have placed in prominent relief. The evils of militarism are patent and striking. The drawbacks of that inward evil which also is gnawing at the base of society and attacks both individuals and classes are hidden, and, if I may use the expression, interstitial.

P. TOPINARD.

PARIS.